



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,319	12/08/1999	SCOTT MOSKOWITZ	066603-0122	6316
29693	7590	11/05/2003	EXAMINER	
WILEY, REIN & FIELDING, LLP ATTN: PATENT ADMINISTRATION 1776 K. STREET N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/456,319	MOSKOWITZ ET AL. <i>[Signature]</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin E Lanier	2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 21-46 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 21-46 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 21, 22, 24-31, 33, 34, 39, 40, 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Newhall, U.S. Patent No. 5,448,206. Referring to claims 1, 21, 22, 25, 28-31, 33, 34, 39, 40, 43, 44, Newhall discloses a method for embedding recoverable sample data into an input signal wherein an input signal is modulated using composing functions (linear predictive coding) that include a Z transform. Once the signal is run through composing functions data samples (carrier signal independent data, watermark) are embedded into the signal based on the results of the composing functions (Figs. 1A, 1B)(Col. 8, line 45 – Col. 9, line 6).

Referring to claim 24, Newhall discloses that the signal is passed through an inverse filter during the encoded stages (Col. 7, lines 53-57).

Referring to claim 26, Newhall discloses that the waveform created by the composing functions is stored in memory (Col. 7, lines 28-32).

Referring to claim 27, Newhall discloses that the composing functions create a waveform that is random in nature (stochastic)(Col. 12, lines 61-68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2132

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newhall, U.S. Patent No. 5,448,206, in view of Schneier. Referring to claims 35-38, Newhall discloses a method for embedding recoverable sample data into an input signal wherein an input signal is modulated using composing functions (linear predictive coding) that include a Z transform. Once the signal is run through composing functions data samples (carrier signal independent data, watermark) are embedded into the signal based on the results of the composing functions (Figs. 1A, 1B)(Col. 8, line 45 – Col. 9, line 6). Newhall does not disclose that the signal and sample information can be compressed. Schneier discloses that compression of data is well known in cryptosystems (page 226). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compress the signal and sample data of Newhall in order to reduce the redundancies in the data as well as save time as disclosed in Schneier (Page 226).

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2132

6. Claims 1, 21-46 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,664. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both involve the embedding of watermark into a signal using Z transform calculations.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Millar, U.S. Patent No. 4,729,112

Clarke, U.S. Patent No. 4,797,923

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 703-305-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 0 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703)305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Benjamin E. Lanier

Justin Darrow
JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER